

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2000  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

- 4th Dist. Jo-Ann Bartold et al., Appellants  
G020529 v.  
Div. 3 Glendale Federal Bank et al., Appellants  
S090367 The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to and including October 26, 2000, or the date upon which review is either granted or denied.
- S004703 People, Respondent  
S004507 v.  
Michael Anthony Cox, Appellant  
-----  
In re Michael Anthony Cox on Habeas Corpus  
On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's reply to petitioner's brief on the merits and exceptions to the report of the referee is extended to and including October 10, 2000.
- S016730 People, Respondent  
v.  
Raymond Edward Steele, Appellant  
On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's brief is extended to and including October 18, 2000.
- S029011 People, Respondent  
v.  
Morris Solomon, Jr., Appellant  
On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including November 27, 2000.
- S029460 People, Respondent  
v.  
Randall Scott Cash, Appellant  
On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's reply brief is extended to and including October 25, 2000.  
No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S049389 People, Respondent

v.

Thomas Howard Lenart, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including November 27, 2000.

S050851 People, Respondent

v.

Ernest Edward Dykes, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including November 21, 2000, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court in writing as soon as the act as to which the Court has granted an extension of time has been completed.

S075679 In re William Kirkpatrick, Jr.

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file petitioner's reply to informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including November 17, 2000.

S079656 In re Miguel Angel Bacigalupo

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including October 13, 2000.

S085976 In re Herbert James Coddington

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including October 30, 2000.

S051451 People, Respondent

v.

Alfredo Valencia, Appellant

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, the State Public Defender is hereby appointed to represent appellant Alfredo Valencia for the direct appeal in the above automatic appeal now pending in this court.

S081555 In the Matter of the Suspension of Attorneys  
For Nonpayment of Dues

Due to clerical error on the part of the State Bar of California, and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the order of suspension for nonpayment of dues filed on September 10, 2000, effective September 27, 1999, be amended *nunc pro tunc* to strike the name of **George Genesta**.

S089997 In re **Thomas E. Lantz** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Thomas E. Lantz, State Bar No. 102205**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law in accordance with standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct; that execution of the two-year suspension be stayed; and that Lantz be placed on probation for two years on conditions including that he be actually suspended from the practice of law during the first year of his probation and until he makes restitution to Maria Arenas, or the Client Security Fund, if it has paid, in the sum of \$8,000, plus interest thereon at the rate of 10% per annum from July 31, 1992, until paid and until he provides satisfactory proof of such restitution to the State Bar's Probation Unit in Los Angeles. In addition, Lantz is ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Review Department of the State Bar Court in its opinion filed on April 24, 2000. If the period of Lantz's actual suspension extends for two or more years, he shall remain on actual suspension until he shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law in accordance with standard 1.4(c)(ii)

of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. Lantz is also ordered to take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Lantz is further ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S089998 In re **Robert Earl Mitchell** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **Robert Earl Mitchell, State Bar No. 165631**, be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. He is also ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S089999 In re **Robert Earl Mitchell** on Discipline

In light of the disbarment order filed September 22, 2000, in S089998, the above-entitled matter is dismissed.

S090005 In re **Suzanne Negahbani** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Suzanne Negahbani, State Bar No. 162594**, be suspended from the practice of law for six months, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that she be placed on probation for one year subject to the conditions of probation, including restitution, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on May 26, 2000. Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2001 and 2002. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10.)

S090016      In re **Albert Kojo Amanquah** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Albert Kojo Amanquah, State Bar No. 153339**, be suspended from the practice of law for three years, that execution of said suspension be stayed, and that he be actually suspended from the practice of law for 18 months and until he attends the State Bar Ethics School and takes and passes the test given at the end of such session, as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed December 31, 1999, as amended by its order filed April 12, 2000; and until the State Bar Court grants a motion to terminate his actual suspension pursuant to rule 205 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California. **Albert Kojo Amanquah** is also ordered to comply with the conditions of probation, if any, hereinafter imposed by the State Bar Court as a condition for terminating his actual suspension. If he is actually suspended for two years or more, he shall remain actually suspended until he provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S090017      In re **Karen A. Corbin** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Karen A. Corbin, State Bar No. 89174**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that she be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation, including actual suspension of 90 days and until he makes restitution as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation executed on May 22, 2000. If the

period of actual suspension is two years or greater, she shall remain suspended until she provides proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of her rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. It is also ordered that she take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order or during the period of her actual suspension, whichever is longer. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that she comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that she perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2001 and 2002.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S090010

In re **Timothy L. McCandless** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Timothy L. McCandless, State Bar No. 147715**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years consecutive to the period of probation ordered in S072495 (State Bar Court case nos. 95-O-11810 and 95-O-17946 (Cons.)) on condition that he be actually suspended for 60 days and until he makes specified restitution and provides satisfactory proof thereof to the Probation Unit, Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed June 12, 2000. If respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he shall remain actually suspended until he provides proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. It is further ordered that, if respondent is actually suspended for 90 days or more, he shall comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 days, respectively, after the

effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2001 and 2002.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S090013

In re **David Matthew Philips** on Discipline

It is ordered that **David Matthew Philips, State Bar No. 45761**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation, including 90 days actual suspension, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation executed on June 26, 2000. It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments prior to February 1 of calendar years 2001 and 2002.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)